

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:
GEOFFREY L. MELNICK
G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD.
11 MENACHEM BEGIN STREET
RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL 52521

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 28994		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 15 SEP 2006
FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International application No. PCT/IL05/00012	International filing date (day/month/year) 04 January 2005 (04.01.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 07 January 2004 (07.01.2004)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G06K 9/00; G06K 9/36 and US CL: 382/168,172,276		
Applicant RAMOT AT TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY LTD.		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703)305-3230	Date of completion of this opinion 27 September 2005 (27.09.2005)	Authorized officer Amir Alavi Telephone No. 571-272-7766
---	--	--

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2005)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/L05/00012

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 the international application in the language in which it was filed
 a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 on paper
 in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IL05/00012

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims 3-62 and 65-125

YES

Claims 1-2 and 63-64

NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims 3-62 and 65-125

YES

Claims NONE

NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims 3-62 and 65-125

YES

Claims 1-2 and 63-64

NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-2 and 63-64 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Chu et al. (USPN 6,798,918 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Chu et al., disclose: fitting the intensity histogram to a sum of a plurality of localized functions, using said plurality of localized functions to define a plurality of localized intensity histograms, for each localized intensity histogram, performing at least one image enhancement procedure, thereby providing a plurality of improved localized intensity histograms and combining said plurality of improved localized intensity histograms, thereby transforming the intensity histogram of the image (please note, column 4, lines 64-67 and column 5, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 2, Chu et al., disclose, wherein each localized function of said plurality of localized functions is independently selected from the group consisting of a Gaussian function, a Lorentzian function, a hyperbolic secant function, a logistic distribution, a Fourier transform and a Wavelet transform. (please note, column 4, lines 44-53).

Regarding claims 63-64, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1-2, respectively, are applicable.

Claims 3-62 and 65-125 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(4), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest, wherein each localized intensity histogram of said plurality of localized intensity histograms is characterized by an intensity range having a minimal intensity value and a maximal intensity value, such that at least one of said minimal and maximal intensity values coincides with an intersection point between two localized function of said plurality of localized functions.